

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 11-20 have been canceled.

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

I. Double patenting rejection

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 11-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting over claims 1 and 3-7 of U.S. Patent No. 7370632 issued May 13, 2008.

A Terminal Disclaimer is submitted with this paper. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection is moot.

II. Lack of written description rejection

Next, in the Office Action, claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as lacking written description.

Claims 11-20 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection is moot.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment
U.S. Appl. No.: **10/595,633**
Attorney Docket No. **PSA0313163**

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 502759.

Respectfully submitted,

/nicolas seckel/

Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,373

Nicolas E. Seckel
Patent Attorney
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-669-5169
Fax: 202-822-1257
Customer No.: 29980
NES/rep